

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-14 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 7 and 13-14 are amended.

Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and below remarks is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiners Sain and Bashore at the interview held July 15, 2004, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5 and 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Burkett (U.S. Patent No. 6,635,089); and rejects claims 4 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Burkett in view of Chau (U.S. Patent No. 6,643,633). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

In particular, Burkett does not disclose or suggest synthesizing a document processing description having an instruction string for processing the first and second structured documents, as recited in independent claim 1.

Burkett instead discloses at Fig. 4A and col. 9, lines 44-60 that an XML document 400 is adapted for dynamic content retrieval and update. Specifically, the tags 401, 411 specify that the document 400 includes user interface information. The tags 402, 410 indicate that the user interface further includes a panel. The panel identifies dynamic information which is not yet known. A query tag 403 (and its ending tag 409) indicates to the program processing the XML document 400 that dynamic information is needed within the panel. Nowhere does Burkett disclose or suggest synthesizing a document processing description.

For reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1, Burkett does not disclose or suggest synthesizing a document processing description, as recited in independent claims 7, 13 and 14.

Burkett also does not disclose or suggest error notice document synthesizing means for inputting the error information to synthesize a document for error notice, as recited in independent claim 12.

Burkett instead discloses at col. 9, lines 10-15 an error handling technique for specifying default values to be used upon occurrence of an error. Nowhere does Burkett disclose or suggest the above-noted features of claim 12.


Chau does not make up for the above-noted deficiencies of Burkett. Specifically, Chau discloses at col. 3, lines 28-30 that an XML data is mapped from an application to relational tables and columns using a document access definition based on XPath data model.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 7 and 12-14 define patentable subject matter. Claims 2-6 and 8-11 depend from the respective independent claims, and therefore also define patentable subject matter as well as for the other features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Yong S. Choi  
Registration No. 43,324

JAO:YSC/eks

Date: July 22, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**  
Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461